



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/007,473 | 11/07/2001 | Noriyuki Yanagimachi | KOT-0036 | 3634 |

7590

04/21/2006

CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

DESHPANDE, KALYAN K

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

3623

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/007,473 | Applicant(s) YANAGIMACHI, NORIYUKI | |
| | Examiner Kalyan K. Deshpande | Art Unit 3623 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-80 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-80 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/29/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Introduction

1. The following is a non-final office action in response to the communications received on November 7, 2001. Claims 1-80 are now pending in this application.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The examiner has reviewed the patents and articles supplied in the Information Disclosure Statements (IDS) provided on April 29, 2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-12, 15, 21-30, 42, 56, and 61-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zinda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6396437).

As per claim 1, Zinda et al. teaches:

An administration system comprising:

at least one job directory for storing a file on a job wherein said job directory is recorded in a recording medium (see column 5 lines 15-28 and column 6 lines 43-58; where a master web directory stores job files on the server and a local working web directory stores files on client terminals.);

Art Unit: 3623

a database for recording the working state of a working subject or of said job (see column 5 lines 15-28; where working items can be stored in a relational database.);

a client terminal (see column 4 lines 48-64; where the system utilizes a client terminal or a plurality of client terminals.);

an application software employed by a client user at each client terminal (see column 4 lines 1-26 and figure 2; where the system is enabled to be utilized by a plurality of application software, including Visual Inter Dev.); and

a working directory on a client terminal provided corresponding to said working subject and said job directory (see column 6 lines 43-58; where client terminals are provided with a working web directory.);

wherein if a connection state, between said working subject or said working directory corresponding thereto and said job directory, is changed, said application software records information regarding said connection state of said working subject onto said database so that said working state of said job is administered (see figures 4 and 5; where a request for a file is administered. The system determines whether that file is checked out and if the file is not checked out, the source control system retrieves the file and records the "checked out" state of the file in the directory or relational database. The same procedure is used to "check in" files as well.).

As per claim 2, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 1, wherein said working state of said working subject, corresponding to said job, is administered (see figures 4 and 5; where a

request for a file is administered. The system determines whether that file is checked out and if the file is not checked out, the source control system retrieves the file and records the "checked out" state of the file in the directory or relational database. The same procedure is used to "check in" files as well.).

As per claim 3, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 1, wherein said working state, corresponding to said job, is determined according to information of said connection state so that said working state of each job is administered (see figures 4 and 5; where the status of a file is dependant on whether the file is not checked out, a user has the file checked out exclusively or a user has the file checked out non-exclusively.).

As per claim 4, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 1, wherein said working subject is said client user (see figures 4 and 5; where the working subject is a client user, client terminal, or front-end or external application software.).

As per claim 5, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 4, wherein said application software is a front-end application software (see column 4 lines 1-26 and figure 2; where the source management system can be used with a front end application such as Visual InterDev.).

As per claim 6, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 1, wherein said working subject is said application software (see column 4 lines 1-26 and figures 2, 4, and 5; where the

Art Unit: 3623

working subject is Visual InterDev. A working subject is the object subjected to working state administration per Specification page 5.).

As per claim 7, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 6, wherein said application software is a front-end application software (see column 4 lines 1-26 and figure 2; where the source management system can be used with a front end application such as Visual InterDev.).

As per claim 8, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 6, wherein said application software is an external application software (see column 4 lines 1-26 and figure 2; where the application software is Visual InterDev. Visual InterDev is an external application from the source control system.).

As per claim 9, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 1, wherein said working subject is said client terminal (see figures 4 and 5; where the working subject is a client terminal. A working subject is the object subjected to working state administration per Specification page 5.).

As per claim 10, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 1, wherein said working directory is only accessible by said working subject, corresponding to said working directory (see column 8 lines 50-67; where a working subject, a client user, can isolate the files in the working directory thereby eliminating access to others.).

Art Unit: 3623

As per claim 11, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 1, wherein said working subject is in a connecting state when said working subject is in work; and said working subject is in a disconnecting state when said working subject is not in work (see figures 4 and 5; where a working subject has a status of having "checked out" a file when the working subject is working on a file. The working subject will not have a status after the working subject has "checked in" a file. A "checked out" status is a connecting state and after a user has "checked in", the user is in a disconnected state.).

As per claim 12, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 1, wherein said information regarding said connection state includes at least pieces of information for identifying said working subject, said job and a change of said connection state (see column 11 lines 25-40 and figure 3; where information displayed for the user includes identifying working subject ("ericzsrv"), said job ("asp", "asa", "htm", and images), and change in connection state (check symbol for files "checked out" and a lock symbol for jobs that are subject to the administration system.).

As per claim 15, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 1, wherein said connecting state is either a state of a connected condition or a state of a disconnected condition (see column 15 lines 17-38 and figures 4-5 and 7; where the user can selected between an isolated mode and a direct connect mode. Direct connect mode is a connected condition and isolated mode is a disconnected condition.).

Art Unit: 3623

As per claim 21, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 1, wherein said working state of said working subject is verified by accessing said database so as that said working state of said working subject is administered (see figure 4-5; where the source control system verifies whether a user has a file "checked out" or not.).

As per claim 22, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 1, wherein said database includes a working subject table which comprises a working subject name and a working subject ID in relation with said client terminal (see figure 3; where the working subject name and working subject ID is "ericzsvr" which is related to the client terminal).

As per claim 23, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 1, wherein said job directory is stored in a recording medium of a file server (see column 5 lines 15-28 and column 6 lines 43-58; where a master web directory stores job files on the server and a local working web directory stores files on client terminals. The job directory can also be stored in a relational database).

As per claim 24, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 17 wherein said database is stored in a database server (see column 5 lines 15-28 and column 6 lines 43-58; where a master web directory stores job files on the server and a local working web directory stores files on client terminals. The job directory can also be stored in a relational database).

Art Unit: 3623

As per claim 25, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 1, wherein said connection state is changed when said application receives an action set on said job as a working object and information for specifying an operation for said action (see figures 3-5; where development in Visual InterDev is controlled by the source control system. The state of files developed using Visual InterDev is changed when a user submits to the system to "check out" a file.).

As per claim 26, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 25, wherein said working state of said action regarding at least one of said client user, said application and said client terminal is administered in accordance with a record of said database (see column 5 lines 15-28 and figures 3-5; where the master directory or relational database records the changes in the working state of the application and clients).

As per claim 27, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 26, wherein said application is a front-end application software (see column 4 lines 1-26 and figure 2; where the source management system can be used with a front end application such as Visual InterDev.).

As per claim 28, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 26, wherein said application is an external application (see column 4 lines 1-26 and figure 2; where the application software is

Art Unit: 3623

Visual InterDev. Visual InterDev is an external application from the source control system.).

As per claim 29, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 25, wherein said application is a front-end application software (see column 4 lines 1-26 and figure 2; where the source management system can be used with a front end application such as Visual InterDev.).

As per claim 30, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 29, wherein said working state of said working subject, regarding said job, is administered by said administration system (see figures 3-5; where the state of a file is administered by the source control system.).

As per claim 42, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 29, wherein said working state, regarding said job, is determined by a piece of information in response with said connection state so that said working state of said job is administered by said administration system (see figures 3-5; where the working state is determined by a request from a user. This information used to determine the working state is the request information from a user.).

As per claim 56, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 1, wherein a plurality of working subjects of said working subject are set as a group corresponding to said job in said job

Art Unit: 3623

directory (see column 4 lines 48-64; where the system utilizes a client terminal or a plurality of client terminals. A plurality of client users or client terminals is a group.).

As per claim 61, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 56, wherein said application software is a front-end application software (see column 4 lines 1-26 and figure 2; where the source management system can be used with a front end application such as Visual InterDev.).

As per claim 62, Zinda et al. teaches:

The administration system of claim 61, wherein said working subject is one of said client user, said front-end application software, a client external application software and said client terminal (see column 4 lines 1-26 and figures 2, 4, and 5; where the working subject is Visual InterDev (a front-end and external application), a client user, or a client terminal. A working subject is the object subjected to working state administration per Specification page 5.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 57, 58, 59, 60, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 77, 78, 79, and 80

are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zinda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6396437) in view of Helgeson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6643652).

As per claims 13 and 14, Zinda et al. fail to teach capturing the time of changes made by users and calculating a working time. Helgeson et al. teach capturing the time of changes made by users and calculating a working time (see column 23 lines 6-10 and column 23 lines 40-44; where the system maintains an auditing log. The auditing log tracks the history of changes to an object, including the time and date of the change. The system further logs information relating to system state and work time.). The advantage of recording the time of changes and determining working time period is that it allows for multiple users to simultaneously edit and merge changes to a working object. Helgeson et al. discloses this feature in an analogous art in order to maintain an audit trail of changes to objects, including information regarding the changes made, who made the changes, and when the changes were made. It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the feature of recording the time of changes and determining working time period disclosed by Helgeson et al. to the Zinda et al. system in order to allow multiple users to simultaneously edit and merge changes to a working object, which is a goal of Zinda et al (see column 2 lines 17-34).

As per claim 16, Zinda et al. teach:

The administration system of claim 1, wherein said database includes a job table which comprises a job ID and a job name (see figure 3; where working and master directory includes a job ID and job name (for example, "bugresult" and

Art Unit: 3623

"newbugresultAction.asp")), a working subject table which comprises a working subject ID and a working subject name (see figure 3; where the working subject name and ID is "ericzsvr"), a working state table which comprises a working subject ID and a working subject state in relation with said job ID (see figure 3; where the working subject ID is "ericzsvr" and the relation is designated by a check symbol.).

Claim 16 further recites limitations already addressed by the rejections of claim 13 and 14; therefore the same rejection applies to this claim.

As per claim 17, Zinda et al. teach:

The administration system of claim 1, wherein when said working subject is brought into a state of a connected condition in response to a command for start or restart of work by said working subject (see figures 4 and 5; where a user selects to "check out" a file rendering the user in a connected state as set forth in the rejection of claim 11), said working state of said working subject is recorded as "Working" in said database (see figures 3-5; where the status of the working subject is designated by a symbol such as the "check" symbol to designate the working subject is working on a file. A state of "checked out" is the same as a state of "Working".); when said working subject is brought into a state of a disconnected condition in response to a command for discontinuation of work by said working subject (see figures 4 and 5; where a user selects to "check in" a file rendering the user in a disconnected state as set forth by the rejection of claim 11), the working state of said working subject is recorded as "Discontinued" in said database (see figures 3-5; where the status of the working subject is changed from having a "check" symbol to having no symbol

Art Unit: 3623

designating the user is not working or has discontinued working on the file. A state of "Discontinued" is the same as "checked in."); and when said working subject is brought into a state of a disconnected condition in response to a command for the end of work by said working subject, the working state of said working subject is recorded as "Terminate" in said database (see figures 4-5; where once the use completes work on a file, the user "checks in" the file. The status of the file is then changed from "checked out" rendering the file available to be "checked out" by others. The master director or relational database records the completion of the "check in" process, which is having the state as "Terminate").

Zinda et al. teach determining and collecting working state data, but fail to expressly teach recording this data. It is old and well-known in the art to record determined a collected data to a file system or database. It is also old and well-known in the art to record working state data to a file system or database. The advantage of recording working state data and calculating work time is that it facilitates the management of tracking change data. It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the feature of recording working state data and calculating work time in order to facilitate the management of tracking change data.

As per claim 18, Zinda et al. teach:

The administration system of claim 17, wherein said working state of said job is recorded as "Working" in said database when said working state of said working subject is in a state of "Working" (see figures 3-5; where the state of a job is

designated as "checked out" when a user is working on a file. The state of "checked out" is the same as "Working").

As per claim 19, Zinda et al. teach:

The administration system of claim 17, wherein said working state of said job is recorded as "Discontinued" in said database when said working state of said working subject is in a state of "Discontinued" (see figures 3-5; where the state of a job is designated as "checked in" when a user is finished working on a file. The state of "checked in" is the same as "Discontinued").

As per claim 20, Zinda et al. teach:

The administration system of claim 17, wherein said working state of said job is recorded as "Terminate" in said database when said working state of said working subject is in a state of "Terminate" (see figures 3-5; where the state of a job is designated as "checked in" when a user is finished working on a file. The state of "checked in" is the same as "Terminate". A state of "Terminate" and "Discontinued" is the same as per Specification page 214).

As per claim 31, Zinda et al. teach:

The administration system of claim 30, wherein said front-end application software causes at least one of a first, second and third working states to be recorded in said database as information regarding said working state of said working subject with respect to said action set on said job (see column 15 lines 17-38; where a user can work in a direct connected state or in an isolated state. The third state a user can working is recorded as "offline").

Claim 31 further recites limitations already addressed by the rejection of claim 17; therefore the same rejection applies to this claim.

Claims 32-34 recite limitations already addressed by the rejections of claims 13-14 and 17; therefore the same rejection applies to these claims.

As per claim 35,

The administration system of claim 31, wherein said first working state is recorded in said database after said front-end application software has acquired from said database a piece of information on a storage position for said job where said action as a working object is set, and a direct connection has been made between said job directory, storing said job, and said working directory according to said piece of information on said storage position (see column 15 lines 17-38 and figures 4-5; where the user can develop in a directly connected state. The working directory of the working subject and master web directory of the server can be merged and updated according to a requested action by the working subject. Visual InterDev also accounts for other portions of newer files that the user wishes to merge together.).

As per claim 36,

The administration system of claim 35, wherein said second working state is recorded in said database after said direct connection has been disconnected by said front-end application software (see column 15 lines 17-38 and figures 4-5 and 7; where the user can selected between an isolated mode and a direct connect mode.).

As per claim 37,

The administration system of claim 35, wherein said third working state is recorded in said database after said direct connection has been disconnected by said front-end application software and a work of said working subject is confirmed (see column 16 lines 30-50; where the user can work in a third working state defined as "offline").

As per claims 38 and 39, Zinda et al. fail to explicitly teach the authentication process for authenticating a working subject prior to accepting a change from a working subject. Helgeson et al. teach an authentication process for authenticating a working subject prior to accepting a change from the working subject (see column 86 lines 52-67; where the system has an authenticator service. The authenticator service validates a requesting working subject prior to incorporating changes submitted by working subject.). The advantage of an authenticating a working subject prior to accepting a submitted change by the working subject is that it minimizes the potential errors in a working object. It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the feature of authenticating a working subject prior to accepting a change request submitted by the working subject taught by Helgeson et al. to the Zinda et al. system in order to minimize the number of errors in a working object, which is a goal of Zinda et al. (see column 2 lines 17-20).

As per claim 40, Zinda et al. teach:

The administration system of claim 31, wherein said job directory is stored in a recording medium of a file server (see column 5 lines 15-28 and column 6 lines 43-

58; where a master web directory stores job files on the server and a local working web directory stores files on client terminals. The job directory can also be stored in a relational database);

Claim 40 further recites limitations already addressed by the rejection of claim 38; therefore the same rejection applies to this claim.

Claim 41 recites limitations already addressed by the rejection of claim 39; therefore the same rejection applies to this claim.

As per claim 43, Zinda et al. teach:

The administration system of claim 42, wherein said front-end application software causes at least one of a first, second, third and fourth action states to be recorded in said database as information regarding a action state of said action set on said job (see column 15 lines 17-38; where a user can work in a direct connected state or in an isolated state. The third state a user can working is recorded as "offline". As per the Specification, the first and second working state are recorded as "Working". As such, the system only differentiates between three workings states which is taught by Zinda et al.'s disclosure of three workings states.).

Claim 43 further recites limitations already addressed by the rejection of claim 17; therefore the same rejection applies to this claim.

Claims 44-46 recite limitations already addressed by the rejections of claim 13-14 and 17; therefore the same rejections apply to these claims.

Claims 47-50 recites limitations already addressed by the rejection of claim 35-37 and 43; therefore the same rejections apply to these claims.

Claim 51-60 recites limitations already addressed by the rejections of claims 17-20, 35, and 37-41; therefore the same rejections apply to these claims.

Claims 63 recites limitations already addressed by the rejections of claim 17, 31, and 42; therefore the same rejections apply to this claim.

Claims 64-66 recite limitations already addressed by the rejections of claim 13-14 and 17; therefore the same rejection apply to these claims.

Claim 67 recites limitations already addressed by the rejection of claim 47; therefore the same rejection applies to this claim.

Claims 68-70 recites limitations already addressed by the rejection of claim 35-37 and 43; therefore the same rejections apply to these claims.

As per claim 71, Zinda et al. teach:

The administration system of claim 63, wherein said second action state, said third action state and fourth action state are determined in accordance with said working state of said plurality of working subjects (see column 4 lines 48-64, column 15 lines 17-38, and figures 4-5;; where the system utilizes a client terminal or a plurality of client terminals. A plurality of client users or client terminals is a group. The system determines which working subjects are performing what actions on the working objects.).

As per claim 72, Zinda et al. teach:

The administration system of claim 71, wherein when said working state of at least one of said plurality of working subjects in said group performing a work for said action is said first working state, a state of said action is recorded as "the

second action state" in said database (see figure 4-5; where a user can "check out" a file only if no other users have the file in a working state of "checked out").

As per claim 73, Zinda et al. teach:

The administration system of claim 71, wherein when said working state of all of said plurality of working subjects in said group performing a work for said action is said third working state, a state of said action is recorded as "the fourth action state" in said database (see figure 4-5; where a user can "check out" a file only if no other users have the file in a working state of "checked out").

Claim 73 further recites limitations addressed by the rejection of claim 43; therefore the same rejection applies to this claim.

As per claim 74, Zinda et al. teach:

The administration system of claim 71, wherein when said working state of at least one of said plurality of working subjects in said group performing a work for said action is said second working state and there is not any one of said plurality of working subjects whose working state is said first working state, a state of said action is recorded as "the third action state" in said database (see figure 4-5; where a user can "check out" a file only if no other users have the file in a working state of "checked out").

Claims 75 and 76 recite limitations already addressed by the rejections of claims 38 and 39; therefore the same rejections apply to these claims.

Claims 77-80 recite limitations already addressed by the rejections of claim 1-76; therefore the same rejections apply to these claims.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following are pertinent to the current invention, though not relied upon:

Tabuchi (U.S. Patent No. 6446093) teaches a distributed system comprising a document server and a plurality of clients which are connected to the document server via a network, each of the plurality of clients transmits, to the document server, an original transaction with information indicative of at least one client which uses a document.

Bhansali et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6006239) teaches a method and system for allowing multiple users to simultaneously edit a spreadsheet.

Zhu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6601087) teaches an apparatus, method, and computer program product for instant document sharing.

Marshall et al. (Marshall, Patrick; Murdock, Michelle; Sercan, Ayse; "Document Management Software: Making Order Out of Chaos", *InfoWorld*, July 10, 1995) teaches a method and system for a file management software system.

Freed (Freed, Les; "Fujitsu Software Corp.: TeamWare Office", *PC Magazine*, May 5, 1998) teaches an office suite that enables document sharing.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kalyan K. Deshpande whose telephone number is (571) 272-5880. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-5pm.

Art Unit: 3623

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


kkd


TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600